

# CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF LOGISTICS AND TRANSPORT IN IRELAND

## PRINCIPAL MARKER'S REPORT FORM

### DANGEROUS GOODS SAFETY ADVISER EXAMINATION

**SUBJECT:** ROAD

**PRINCIPAL MARKER:**

**EXAMINATION DATE:** 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2017

**No Attempting Examination:** 56

**No Passing Examination:** 52

**% Pass Rate:** 92.86%

**Average Mark** 40.23

#### A. General Comments

Another fine set of results especially considering the number of candidates being so large. Congratulations to the one candidate who scored 100%.

Candidates had a choice of four case studies. These concerned:

- the international transport of a mixed consignment of dangerous goods, one of which was a Limited Quantity
- the international transport in a two compartment UN portable tank of two different substances
- the domestic transport of a dangerous goods fertilizer and powdery substance used as a pesticide.
- the domestic transport of a blasting explosive in a mobile explosive mixing unit (MEMU)

No less than 68% of candidates chose the first, just 13.5% of candidates chose the second, 14% the fourth with as few as 0.5% choosing the third.

The average marks (out of 35) for the case studies were 29.61, 25.29, 32.00 and 25.75 respectively.

As is my normal practice, I will just highlight below the major issues insofar as there are any concerning the four case studies.

#### B. Comments on Individual Questions

*Please make comments as appropriate for each question.*

#### Case Study 1A

Candidates should remember that there are two quantity limits which dictate whether dangerous goods may be carried as Limited Quantities – the maximum capacity or mass of the inner packagings and the maximum gross mass allowed for the boxes (30kg) or trays (20kg). Both are usually required but some candidate failed to give one or the other.

There was a question about the language requirements for the ADR road-mode transport document (CMR Note?). I expected precision in candidates' answers. The question invited candidates to "draw a conclusion". I wanted them to say that the document needed to be drawn up in Danish and then in one or other of the three official languages of the ADR, English, French or German. 31.5% of candidates who took this case study did not specifically state that Danish was required or if they did gave another language. Even Dutch was suggested.

Candidates were asked about the options available for the driver to leave his vehicle unattended. Candidates were asked specifically to address the quantity of the dangerous good concerned being carried. It meant that candidates had to discover that Special Provision for Carriage – Operation No. S19 applied which states that the provisions of Chapter 8.4 are triggered if the load exceeds 5000 kg which it did. 39% of candidates did not do this and therefore did not answer this part of the case study correctly.

A question about tunnel codes foxed some candidates. Candidates should realise that where there is a double tunnel code allocated to a substance e.g. (D/E) the first code, in this case "D" applies to tanks and bulk transport and the second to the transport of packaged goods. I expected candidates to explain this in their answers. 26% of candidates who took this case study did not demonstrate this piece of knowledge.

Candidates were asked what should be done as a spillage of the toxic chemical had been discovered on delivery. It required candidates to affirm that Special Provision for Carriage – Loading, Unloading and Handling CV13 from 7.5.11 of Chapter 7.5 of ADR where the answer as to what to do can be found. 23.5% of candidates who took this case study took some other route to their answer and consequently lost marks.

### **Case Study 1B**

Where candidates came unstuck the most with this case study concerned whether it was acceptable to load two different substances in adjoining compartments of the two-compartment UN portable tank in the question. Only one candidate who took this case study got it right. They should have looked at 4.2.1.6 of Chapter 4.2 of ADR and linked this to the definition of incompatible reactions to be avoided given in Chapter 1.2 of ADR. This is an important consideration.

The occasional answer was based on Chapter 4.3 or Chapter 6.8 of ADR. These two chapters are not appropriate for this case study. Answers should be given from Chapters 4.2 or 6.7 where relevant. Any answers based on Chapters 4.3 or Chapter 6.8 including references were not accepted. UN portable tanks are not the same as RID/ADR tank-containers even if they look alike at first take.

A few candidates got mixed up with the safety obligations of the participants (in the transport chain), Chapter 1.4. For example, mentioning the loader instead of the filler. Loaders load

packaged dangerous goods. Fillers fill tanks (and bulk).

The final question, concerning the minimum degrees of filling required for portable tanks was badly answered. Firstly 62.5% of candidates who took this case study set off down the track of the rules concerning the *maximum degrees* of filling when the question was about the minimum degree of filling. The others could not attempt the question so that no one gave a fully satisfactory answer. The answer is at least 80% full unless other situations apply as described in 4.2.1.9.6 of Chapter 4.2.

A number of candidates did not appear to be aware of the so-called 80% minimum filling rule for portable tanks or if they were, perhaps they were uncertain where to locate it (in Chapter 4.2).

### **Case Study 1C**

An important part of this case study, worth seven marks concerned the small load exemptions of 1.1.3.6.3 of Chapter 1.1 of ADR. Those who did well in this case study dealt with this part well. Most did not. Some mistook it for a Limited Quantities question or unnecessarily multiplied the quantities by 3 when the two dangerous goods items had the same Transport Category.

### **Case Study 1D**

Although the average mark scored by the candidates who took this case study is second lowest there was no outstanding feature in their scripts that I can point to as contributing more than any other part of this case study being its cause.

### **The Part B Questions**

Question 2: This was a question concerning the fixed penalty payable by a DGSA not performing his or her functions. A few could not do it not even realising that it meant consulting the domestic regulations. I wanted candidates specifically to say that this was a No. 47 offence for full marks. 43% of candidates did not do this.

Question 3: This was a question whether a certain substance counted as a High Consequence Dangerous Good. Most read the table in Chapter 1.10 correctly but 13% attempted an answer from some other source in the ADR...

Question 4: In this two part question candidates were asked firstly whether it was legitimate according to ADR for a helper to help unload is permitted in the cab to accompany a driver. Most got this right including the second part where it was clear from the question that the person in the cab was a passenger and had no business being there. It would have been good if as well as saying that the helper would not be allowed until s/he had received some training that this was only allowable if s/he had been appointed a member of the crew.

Question 5: The final question, in three parts concerned the provisions set out in Chapter 9.1 for the approval of vehicles intended to carry tanks of any kind described in the ADR. It firstly meant that candidates had to establish that for the substance concerned an AT vehicle (all other tanks vehicle) was required. 38% of candidates mistook the thrust of the question and attempted answers from either Chapter 6.8 or gave the RID/ADR tank code applicable to the substance concerned. Remarkably even though many gave the wrong answer to the first

part virtually everybody got the second and third parts of this question right, reading their answers from Chapter 9.1.

**C. Comments on Candidates' Performance (include identification of any gaps in knowledge\areas of weakness)**

Any comments appear above.

**D. Comments on the Marking Process**

None.

SIGNATURE: .....DATE: .....

Roadreport/dgsa